



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,305	03/29/2004	Michael John Wray	1509-494	8275
22879	7590	07/02/2007	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY			YOUNG, NICOLE M	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION				
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			2139	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/811,305	WRAY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Nicole M. Young	2139		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in respond to the application filed on March 29, 2004.

Claims 1-12 are pending. The Examiner acknowledges the use of "means for" in the claim language and considers U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph to be invoked.

Drawings

New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because Figures 1, 2, 4A and 4B are hand drawn and/or have handwritten corrections. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 8, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims use the language "means for" without a corresponding structure in the specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-12 objected to because of the following informalities: claims 1 and 12 state "logically protected computer environments (or "compartments")". Please replace with one term or the other. Claims 2-11 are dependent on claim 1 and are therefore rejected as well. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 10 objected to because of the following informalities: claim 10 states "the or each". This is not grammatically correct. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wiseman et al. (US 7,216,369)** hereinafter Wiseman and further in view of **Sutton, II et al. (US 2003/0229794)** hereinafter Sutton.

Wiseman teaches in **Claims 1 and 12** a system comprising a trusted computing platform, Wiseman does not teach but Sutton teaches including one or more first logically protected computing environments (or "compartments") associated with initialisation of said system,

and one or more second logically protected computing environments (or "compartments"),

the one or each said second logically protected computing environment being associated with at least one service or process supported by said system in paragraph [0024] "one or more trusted applications". It would be obvious to one of skill in the art at the time of invention to have multiple trusted applications. The motivation would be that

a computer would need a "variety of applications, or code sequences" as in paragraph [0024] to operate and they need to be secure,

the system being arranged to load onto said trusted computing platform a predetermined security policy including one or more security rules for controlling the operation of each of said logically protected computing environments (Wiseman column 3 lines 52-62, wherein the policy table 120 is interpreted by the Examiner to be the predetermined security policy and the policies are interpreted to be the security rules.),

such that said security rules relating to the or each first logically protected computing environment are arranged to be loaded onto said trusted computing platform when the system is initialized (Wiseman column 3 lines 60-62 where the "policy table 118 contains policies to which the platform 102 must adhere during the initialization/boot process". The platform is interpreted by the Examiner to be the system.),

and the one or more security rules relating to the or at least one of said second logically protected computing environments are only arranged to be loaded onto said trusted computing platform if one or more services or processes associated therewith are enabled (Wiseman column 4 lines 42-55 teach the policies initialization during boot and lines 62-67 teach comparing the policies to the component or platform)

Claim 2 discloses a system according to claim 1, wherein one or more common variables are defined for each compartment, in respect of which the relevant security rules are only arranged to be added if that variable is enabled for a particular

compartment (Wiseman column 5 lines 42-55 teach the policies initialization during boot and lines 62-67 teach comparing the policies to the component or platform).

Claim 3 discloses a system according to claim 2, wherein one or more of a number of variables associated with a directory of plug-ins are arranged to be added (Wiseman column 5 lines 56-61 where the sections are interpreted by the examiner to be the plug-ins and a flag indicates which are required).

Claim 4 discloses a system according to claim 3, wherein the system is arranged to determine, in response to a compartment being enabled, the status of said variables and cause the relevant plug-in(s) to run only if an associated variable is 'true' (Wiseman column 5 lines 56-61 where the sections are interpreted by the examiner to be the plug-ins and a flag indicates which are required. The Examiner interprets the flag to be a variable that is 'true').

Claim 5 discloses a system according to claim 4, wherein the or each compartment includes an operating system compartment arranged to be controlled by the operating system kernel (Sutton paragraph [0023] teaches a trusted kernel and paragraph [0024] and multiple operating systems, teaches the operating system controlled by the kernel).

Claim 6 discloses a system according to claim 5, wherein the compartments and network resources are arranged so communication between them is provided via relatively narrow kernel level controlled interfaces to a transport mechanism (Sutton paragraph [0030]).

Claim 7 discloses a system according to claim 6, wherein said communication interfaces are arranged to be governed by rules specified on a compartment by

compartment basis (Wiseman column 5 lines 42-55 teach the policies initialization during boot and lines 62-67 teach comparing the policies to the component or platform).

Claim 8 discloses a system according to claim 7, including means for determining when a service is starting, and on being enabled, for loading the compartment associated with that service and loading the security rules associated with that service (Wiseman column 5 lines 56-61 where the sections are interpreted by the examiner to be the plug-ins and a flag indicates which are required. The structure is shown in Figure 1.).

Claim 9 discloses a system according to claim 8, including means for determining when a service starts, and causing said security rules to be loaded accordingly (Wiseman column 5 lines 56-61 where the sections are interpreted by the examiner to be the plug-ins and a flag indicates which are required. The structure is shown in Figure 1.).

Claim 10 discloses a system according to claim 1, wherein the or each compartment includes an operating system compartment arranged to be controlled by the operating system kernel (Sutton paragraph [0023] teaches a trusted kernel and paragraph [0024] and multiple operating systems, teaches the operating system controlled by the kernel).

Claim 11 discloses a system according to claim 1, including means for determining when a service is starting, and on being enabled, for loading the compartment associated with that service and loading the security rules associated with that service (Wiseman column 5 lines 56-61 where the sections are interpreted by the examiner to be the plug-ins and a flag indicates which are required).

Note: Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record and in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the

specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. Applicant should consider the entire prior art as applicable to the limitations of the claims. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing for response, to consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the Examiner.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicole M. Young whose telephone number is 571-270-1382. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, alt Fri off, 8:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


TAGHIARANI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

6/22/10 2

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NMY
6/22/2007